arXiv:quant-ph/0502043v2 23 Jul 2005

Entanglement of zero angular momentum mixtures and black hole entropy

Etera R. Livine[*], **Daniel R. Terno**[†]
Perimeter Institute, 31 Caroline St, Ontario, Canada N2L 2Y5

We calculate the entanglement of formation and the entanglement of distillation for arbitrary mixtures of the zero spin states on an arbitrary-dimensional bipartite Hilbert space. Such states are relevant to quantum black holes and to decoherence-free subspaces based communication. The two measures of entanglement are equal and scale logarithmically with the system size. We discuss its relation to the black hole entropy law. Moreover, these states are locally distinguishable but not locally orthogonal, thus violating a conjecture that the entanglement measures coincide only on locally orthogonal states. We propose a slightly weaker form of this conjecture. Finally, we generalize our entanglement analysis to any unitary group.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 04.70.Dy

For slightly more than a decade entanglement is a resource of quantum information theory and not just a mystery in foundations of quantum mechanics [1, 2]. It is recognized in systems ranging from spin chains [3] to black holes [4]. However, even the entanglement between two parties remains a slightly bewildering subject, because not much is known beyond the two-qubit mixed states. There are various measures of a mixed-state entanglement that reflect different aspects of their preparation and manipulation [5]. Recently there was a progress in showing equivalence between different conjectured properties of entanglement measures and communication channels [6] and in estimating entanglement of generic high-dimensional bipartite states [7]. However, it is rarely possible to calculate entanglement of a high-dimensional mixed state, unless some symmetries or constraints are involved [8].

In this article we present a class of bipartite mixed states for which it is possible to calculate entanglement exactly. Moreover, we show that for this family all standard measures of entanglement [5] are equal. We start from a particular state that actually appears in the black hole entropy calculations (for more details see [9]). It is the completely mixed state on the SU(2) invariant space of an arbitrary number of qubits. We then generalize it to the arbitrary mixtures of zero angular momentum states in any dimension. These states are locally distinguishable but not locally orthogonal (in the sense of [10]). As a result, they form a counterexample to the conjectures of [10], but satisfy its slightly weaker form (see below). These ideas are also relevant to decoherence-free subspaces of qubits and to communication protocols without a shared reference frame [11].

In the simplest scenario, the black hole entropy calculation is reduced to counting the number of distinct SU(2) invariant states on the space of $2n$ qubits. This can be understood within the framework of loop quantum gravity [9]. The ignorance of a particular microstate makes the statistical state under consideration to be a maximally mixed state on the zero angular momentum $\mathbf{J}^2 = 0$ subspace of $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 2n}$ (space of intertwiners). We label this subspace as $\mathcal{H}_0$ and the state as ρ. Its orthogonal decomposition is simply

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|, \tag{1}$$

where $|\Psi_i\rangle$ span a basis of $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathbf{J}^2|\Psi_i\rangle = 0$, and $N \equiv \dim \mathcal{H}_0$. A straightforward calculation [9] gives

$$N = \binom{2n}{n} - \binom{2n}{n+1} = \frac{1}{n+1}\binom{2n}{n}. \tag{2}$$

In the limit of large n, this gives back the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy and its logarithmic correction:

$$S \equiv -\mathrm{tr}\, \rho \log \rho = \log N \sim 2n \log 2 - \tfrac{3}{2} \log n. \tag{3}$$

More generally, Schur's duality [12] allows to decompose the Hilbert space of the collection of $2n$ qubits as

$$\bigotimes^{2n} \mathbb{C}^2 \cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^{n} \mathcal{H}_j \equiv \bigoplus_{j=0}^{n} V^j \otimes \sigma_{n,j}, \tag{4}$$

where V^j is the irreducible spin-j representation of SU(2), and $\sigma_{n,j}$ is the irreducible representation of the permutation group $\mathbb{S}_{2n}$ that corresponds to the partition $[n+j, n-j]$ of $2n$ objects [13]. For $n = 1$, it is the simple decomposition of two qubits into irreducible representations:

$$(V^{1/2})^{\otimes 2} = V^0 \oplus V^1,$$

---

[*] elivine@perimeterinstitute.ca
[†] dterno@perimeterinstitute.ca

where the singlet state is the antisymmetrized states, while the spin-1 space is defined as the symmetrized state space. For $n = 2$, we are dealing with four qubits:

$$(V^{1/2})^{\otimes 4} = 2V^0 \oplus 3V^1 \oplus V^2.$$

A basis of the singlet space is defined by the two states obtained by antisymmetrizing the qubits (12) and (34) then symmetrizing over the couple of pairs, or dealing with the pairs (13) and (24).

We introduce the multiplicity coefficients $c_j^{(2n)} \equiv \dim \sigma_{n,j}$:

$$c_j^{(2n)} = \binom{2n}{n+j} - \binom{2n}{l+n+1} = \binom{2n}{n+j}\frac{2j+1}{n+j+1}. \tag{5}$$

We recognize $N = c_0^{(2n)}$. Moreover these multiplicities satisfy $2^{2n} = \sum_j c_j^{(2n)}(2j+1)$ and $\binom{2n}{n} = \sum_j c_j^{(2n)}$[1].

We are interested to find how much entanglement is contained in arbitrary bipartite splittings of this state. Let Alice hold $2k \le n$ qubits and Bob handle the rest. The Hilbert spaces of Alice and Bob are $\mathcal{H}_A \equiv (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 2k}$ and $\mathcal{H}_B \equiv (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes 2n-2k}$, respectively. Using the Schur's duality formula for both Alice and Bob, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes^{2n} \mathbb{C}^2 &= \bigotimes^{2k} \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \bigotimes^{2n-2k} \mathbb{C}^2 \\ &= \bigoplus_{j_A, j_B} (V^{j_A} \otimes V^{j_B}) \otimes (\sigma_{k,j_A} \otimes \sigma_{n-k,j_B}), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $j_{A,B}$ running up to $k, n-k$. In the following, we will also denote $\sigma_{k,j}$ and $\sigma_{n-k,j}$ as $\sigma^j_{A,B}$. Singlets are obtained when $j_A = j_B \equiv j$:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = V^0 \otimes \sigma_{n,0} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{k} V^0_{(j)} \otimes (\sigma_{k,j} \otimes \sigma_{n-k,j}), \tag{7}$$

where $V^0_{(j)}$ is the singlet state in $V^j \otimes V^j$. Hence the dimensionality of $\mathcal{H}_0$ is related to the multiplicities $c_j^{A,B}$ through

$$N = c_0^{(2n)} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j^{(2k)} c_j^{(2n-2k)}. \tag{8}$$

The basis states of Alice and Bob are respectively labeled as $|j, m, a_j\rangle$ and $|j, m, b_j\rangle$. Here $0 \le j \le k (\le n-k)$ and $-j \le m \le j$ have their usual meaning and the degeneracy labels, a_j and b_j, enumerate the different subspaces V^j (i.e. count the basis vectors in the representations of $\sigma_{k,j}$ and $\sigma_{n-k,j}$). The constraint $\mathbf{J}^2 = 0$ ensures the states $|\Psi_i\rangle$ are the singlets on $V^j_A \otimes V^j_B$ subspaces for $j = 0, .., k$,

$$|j, a_j, b_j\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2j+1}} \sum_{m=-j}^{j} (-1)^{j-m} |j, -m, a_j\rangle \otimes |j, m, b_j\rangle. \tag{9}$$

Following the decomposition (7) of $\mathcal{H}_0$ a more transparent notation for the states $|\Psi_i\rangle$ is

$$|j, a_j, b_j\rangle \equiv |j\rangle_{AB} \otimes |a_j\rangle_{\sigma^j_A} \otimes |b_j\rangle_{\sigma^j_B}, \tag{10}$$

where $|j\rangle_{AB}$ is the singlet state on $V^j_A \otimes V^j_B$. The totally mixed state then reads

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \sum_{a_j, b_j} |j\rangle\langle j|_{AB} \otimes |a_j\rangle\langle a_j|_{\sigma^j_A} \otimes |b_j\rangle\langle b_j|_{\sigma^j_B}. \tag{11}$$

Alice's reduced density matrices result from the tracing over $\mathcal{H}_B$,

$$\rho_{j,a_j} = \mathrm{tr}_B |j, a_j, b_j\rangle\langle j, a_j, b_j|. \tag{12}$$

These matrices are independent of b_j. There are exactly c_j^B of the matrices ρ_{j,a_j} and they are diagonal, because in the angular momentum basis the states $|j, a_j, b_j\rangle$ are given as the bi-orthogonal (Schmidt) decompositions [1]. Moreover, the only nonzero part of ρ_{j,a_j} is a sequence of $2j+1$ terms $1/(2j+1)$,

$$\rho_{j,a_j} = \frac{1}{2j+1} \mathbb{1}_{V^j} \otimes |a_j\rangle\langle a_j|_{\sigma^j_A}. \tag{13}$$

For convenience we introduce $\rho_j = \mathbb{1}_{V^j}/(2j+1)$. Two matrices ρ_{j,a_j} and ρ_{l,a_l} have orthogonal supports if one or both of their indices are different. The reduced density matrix $\rho_A = \mathrm{tr}_B \rho$ is

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \sum_{a_j} c_j^B \rho_j \otimes |a_j\rangle\langle a_j|_{\sigma^j_A}. \tag{14}$$

We consider the entanglements of formation and distillation. Together they bound all entanglement measures [5],

$$E_D(\rho) \le E(\rho) \le E_F(\rho). \tag{15}$$

The entanglement of formation is defined as follows. A state ρ can be decomposed as a convex combination of pure states,

$$\rho = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha |\Psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\Psi_\alpha|, \qquad \sum_\alpha w_\alpha = 1, \qquad \forall w_\alpha > 0. \tag{16}$$

---

[1] This formula has a natural interpretation in terms of random walks and diffusion processes [9].

The entanglement of formation is the averaged degree of entanglement of the pure states $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle$ (the von Neumann entropy of their reduced density matrices) minimized over all possible decompositions

$$E_F(\rho) = \inf_{\{\Psi_\alpha\}} \sum_\alpha w_\alpha S(\rho_\alpha). \tag{17}$$

The distillable entanglement is the ratio of the number of (standard) maximally entangled output states $|\Phi^+\rangle$ over the needed input states ρ, maximized over all local operations assisted by a classical communication (LOCC), when the limit of infinitely many inputs is taken. Hence

$$E_D(\rho) = \sup_{LOCC} \frac{n^{\text{out}}_{|\Psi^+\rangle}}{n^{\text{in}}_\rho}. \tag{18}$$

Lemma: The entanglement of formation of the state ρ is exactly given by the average of the degrees of entanglement in the (j, a_j, b_j) decomposition. As the von Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrices ρ_j is $S(\rho_{j,a_j}) = S(\rho_j) = \log(2j+1)$, the entanglement is:

$$E_F(\rho) = S_E \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j,a_j,b_j} S(\rho_{j,a_j}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j^A c_j^B \log(2j{+}1). \tag{19}$$

It is instructive to prove this lemma by a direct calculation. All pure states $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle$ that appear in alternative decompositions of ρ ought to be some linear combinations of the states $|j, a_j, b_j\rangle$,

$$|\Psi_\alpha\rangle = \sum_{j,a_j,b_j} c_{\alpha,j a_j b_j} |j\rangle_{AB} \otimes |a_j\rangle_{\sigma_A^j} \otimes |b_j\rangle_{\sigma_B^j}. \tag{20}$$

The diagonal form of ρ forces the coefficients $c_{\alpha,j a_j b_j}$ to satisfy the normalization condition

$$\sum_\alpha w_\alpha c_{\alpha,j a_j b_j} c^*_{\alpha,l a_l b_l} = \frac{1}{N} \delta_{jl} \delta_{a_l a_j} \delta_{b_j b_l}. \tag{21}$$

Alice's reduced density matrices $\rho_A(\alpha) = \text{tr}_B |\Psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\Psi_\alpha|$ are

$$\rho_A(\alpha) = \sum_j \sum_{b_j} \sum_{a_j, a_j'} c_{\alpha,j a_j b_j} c^*_{\alpha,j a_j' b_j} \rho_j \otimes |a_j\rangle\langle a_j'|_{\sigma_A^j}. \tag{22}$$

Introducing

$$\lambda_{\alpha,j a_j a_j'} = \sum_{b_j} c_{\alpha,j a_j b_j} c^*_{\alpha,j a_j' b_j}, \quad \pi_j(\alpha) = \sum_{a_j} \lambda_{\alpha,j,a_j a_j}, \tag{23}$$

we rewrite the reduced density matrix of $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\Psi_\alpha|$ as

$$\rho_A(\alpha) = \sum_j \pi_j(\alpha) \rho_j \otimes \Lambda_j(\alpha), \tag{24}$$

where the fictitious density matrix Λ was introduced on the degeneracy subspace σ_A^j,

$$\Lambda_j(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi_j(\alpha)} \sum_{a_j a_j'} \lambda_{\alpha,j a_j a_j'} |a_j\rangle\langle a_j'|_{\sigma_A^j}. \tag{25}$$

From the orthogonality of the matrices ρ_{j,a_j} and Eq. (21)it is easy to see that

$$\sum_\alpha w_\alpha \lambda_{\alpha,j a_j a_j'} = \frac{1}{N} c_j^B \delta_{a_j a_j'}. \tag{26}$$

The weighted average of the entanglement of the decomposition $\{\Phi_\alpha\}$ is $\langle S(\{\Phi_\alpha\})\rangle \equiv \sum_\alpha w_\alpha S(\rho_A(\alpha))$. From Eq. (25) and the concavity property of entropy [1, 14] it follows that

$$\langle S(\{\Phi_\alpha\})\rangle \geq \sum_{\alpha,j} w_\alpha \pi_j(\alpha) \left[S(\rho_j) + S(\Lambda_j(\alpha))\right] \geq \sum_{\alpha,j} w_\alpha \pi_j(\alpha) S(\rho_j) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j c_j^A c_j^B S(\rho_j). \tag{27}$$

QED

We illustrate this result by two particularly interesting cases [9]. For simplicity we work in the large n limit. To start with, let Alice and Bob have n qubits each. In this case, $c_j^{A,B} \equiv c_j$, so

$$E_F(\rho|n:n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{n/2} c_j^2 \log(2j+1). \tag{28}$$

At leading order

$$E_F(\rho|n:n) \approx \log(2j_{\max}^{(n)}+1), \tag{29}$$

where the coefficients c_j reach a maximal value for $j \equiv j_{\max}^{(n)} \approx \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{n+2}-1$. Thus,

$$E_F(\rho|n:n) \approx \tfrac{1}{2}\log n. \tag{30}$$

Such entanglement is at the origin of the logarithmic corrections to the black hole entropy law. More precisely, in a model where the black hole horizon would be constructed out of independent uncorrelated qubits, the entropy would scale simply linearly to the number of qubits $2n$. However, the requirement of invariance under SU(2) creates correlations between the horizon qubits, which are revealed through the logarithmic correction $3/2\log n$ to the entropy law formula (3). Here we notice a factor 3 between the actual correlation and the entanglement, which quantifies the quantum correlations. The difference quantifies the purely classical correlations, which turn out to be roughly twice the quantum correlations. It seems that this is related to a factor 3 noticed between the classical channel capacity and the quantum channel capacity for secure communication protocols based on decoherence-free subspaces [16].

More generally, we find that for all bipartite splittings of the spin network with sufficiently large number of qubits comprising the smaller space, it is possible to show that

$$I_\rho(A:B) \equiv S(\rho_A)+S(\rho_B)-S(\rho) \simeq 3S_E(\rho|A:B) \tag{31}$$

(the quantum mutual information [17] between the black hole horizon and its parts is three times the entanglement between the halves). Moreover, if the ratio between the number of qubits is keep fixed while n is arbitrary, the logarithmic correction $\frac{3}{2}\log n$ asymptotically equals to $I_\rho(A:B)$, so the deviation of the black hole entropy from its classical value equals to the total amount of correlations between the halves of spin networks that describe it (see [9] for more details).

Now we can push the use of entanglement further. We consider the set-up when Alice has 2 qubits and Bob holds the rest. In this case $c_{0,1}^A = 1$, and Bob's multiplicities asymptotically satisfy $c_0^B/N \approx 1/4$, $c_1^B/N \approx 3/4$. Hence

$$E_F(\rho|2:2n-2) = \frac{c_1^B}{N}\log 3 \approx \frac{3}{4}\log 3. \tag{32}$$

The fact that this actual entanglement is not the maximal entanglement $\log 4$ can be interpreted as the pair of qubits not being maximally attached to the horizon, i.e. having a non-vanishing probability of getting detached from the horizon and evaporating from the black hole. This logic can be made more precise in the context of loop quantum gravity [15], and the unentangled fraction c_0^B/N can be shown to be related to the black hole evaporation rate [9]. An important detail is that the unentangled fraction converges to a non-zero constant value for large black holes, which means that the pair of qubits are a constant probability of evaporating independently of the size of the black hole. This seems at first in contradiction with the behavior of the Hawking radiation. Nevertheless, to turn a probability into a rate, we need a time scale. Choosing a time scale proportional to the mass to the black hole in the semi-classical regime, we recover the right expected behavior [9]. Such a time scale can be defined for example as the period of the smallest circular orbit around the black hole.

Let us now compute the distillable entanglement of ρ. From Eq. (11) it is obvious that Alice and Bob can exactly identify the states $|j,a_j,b_j\rangle$ by LOCC. It suggests a simple distillation strategy: Alice and Bob project onto one of the states $|j,a_j,b_j\rangle$. From Eq. (11) it follows that with a probability

$$p_j = c_j^A c_j^B/N \tag{33}$$

they end up with a singlet on $V_A^j \otimes V_B^j$. Such a state contains $\log(2j+1)$ ebits of entanglement (it can be converted into this number of the standard singlets). Hence the protocol yields S_E of the distillable entanglement. Since $E_D(\rho) \le E_F(\rho) \le S_E$ this protocol provides a concise proof of the Lemma and shows that

$$E_D(\rho) = E_F(\rho) = S_E. \tag{34}$$

The are two natural ways in which this setup can be generalized. First, the elementary systems that Alice and Bob hold can be of any fixed dimension. In the case of $2n$ objects of some higher spin $s \in \mathbb{N}/2$, the degeneracy subspaces σ^j are not irreducible representations of the permutation group, but the labeling of the states as $|j,a_j,b_j\rangle$ and the entire chain of reasoning that led to Eq. (34) remain unchanged. It is interesting to note that the logarithmic dependence of the entanglement on the system size also persists for arbitrary spins. Indeed, numerical simulations and explicit calculations of the black hole entropy [9] shows that the asymptotic estimate of Eq. (29) is independent of the basic unit: $j_{\max}^{(n)}$ still goes proportionally to $\sqrt{n}$ at first order, so that $E_F(\rho|n:n) \sim \frac{1}{2}\log n$. In particular, we derive the same $-3/2$ factor in front of the logarithmic correction to the black hole entropy law (3) whatever spin s we use to construct the model of quantum black hole.

The second point is that the mixture does not have to be equally weighted. The same steps as above lead to the following result.

Proposition: Consider an arbitrary convex combination of the zero spin states,

$$\rho = \sum_j \sum_{a_j,b_j} w^{(j)}_{a_j,b_j} |j\rangle\langle j|_{AB} \otimes |a_j\rangle\langle a_j|_{\sigma^A} \otimes |b_j\rangle\langle b_j|_{\sigma^B}, \quad \sum_{a_j,b_j} w^{(j)}_{a_j,b_j} = 1 \tag{35}$$

all measures of entanglement for the state ρ are equal to

$$S_E(\rho) = \sum_{j,a_j,b_j} w^{(j)}_{a_j,b_j} \log(2j+1). \tag{36}$$

The only change in the calculation of E_D is that

$$p_j = \sum_{a_j,b_j} w^{(j)}_{a_j,b_j}, \tag{37}$$

so for any state of the form (35) its distillable entanglement is given by Eq. (36) and is equal to its entanglement of formation.

In [10] it was proven that mixed states that are represented by an ensemble $\rho = \sum_i |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|/N$ of locally orthogonal ensembles satisfy $E_F(\rho) = E_D(\rho)$. The family of bipartite pure states $\{\Psi_1, \ldots \Psi_N\}$ is locally orthogonal if it can be ordered in such a way that for each i the local reductions satisfy

$$\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho^i_X \rho^j_X) = 0, \tag{38}$$

on a fixed subspace X, where $j > i$, and X stands for either A or B subspace. It was also conjectured that the entanglement measures coincide only for such mixed states. While the states ρ_{j,a_j} indeed satisfy Eq. (38), the reductions of the sates $|j, a_j, b_j\rangle$ that differ only by b_j lead to the same ρ_{j,a_j} and hence are identical. Nevertheless, the states $|j, a_j, b_j\rangle$ are distinguishable by LOCC, and this is enough to establish the equality of the entanglement measures. Hence, we propose that the conjecture should be modified, i.e. the decomposing ensemble should consist of the states that are distinguishable by LOCC without being destroyed.

Let us conclude with the fact that our results hold for any unitary group. Indeed, using U(M) or SU(M) instead of SU(2), Schur's duality and the decomposition of tensor powers of the fundamental representation in terms of representations of the permutation group still hold. Therefore one is lead to the same result that all measures of entanglement on arbitrary mixtures on the invariant subspace of the tensor products of qudits are equal, with the same consequences in terms of the black hole entropy law.

We thank Aram Harrow, Pawel Horedecki, Martin Plenio, and Karol Życzkowski for discussions and helpful comments.

---

[1] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993).

[2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000).

[3] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).

[4] A. Peres and D. R. Terno, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 93 (2004).

[5] M. Horodecki, Quantum Info. Comp. **1**, 3 (2001); P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Quantum Info. Comp. **1**, 45 (2001); D. Bruß, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4237 (2002).

[6] P. W. Shor, Commun. Math. Phys. **246**, 453 (2004); K. M. R. Audenaert and S. L. Braunstein, Commun. Math. Phys. **246**, 443 (2004); A. S. Holevo andM. E. Shirokov, Commun. Math. Phys. **249**, 417 (2004).

[7] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, and A. Winter, e-print quant-ph/0407094 (2004).

[8] J. Eisert, T. Felbinger, P. Papadopoulos, M. B. Plenio, and M. Wilkens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1611 (2000).

[9] E. R. Livine and D. R. Terno, in preparation (2005).

[10] P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, Acta Phys. Slov. **48**, 141 (1998), e-print quant-ph/9805072.

[11] S. D. Bartlett and D. R. Terno, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012302 (2005); S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 027901 (2003).

[12] R. Goodman and N. R. Wallach, *Representations and Invariants of the Clssical Groups* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).

[13] W.-K. Tung, *Group Theory in Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985)

[14] A. Wehrl, Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, 221 (1978).

[15] C. Rovelli, *Loop Quantum Gravity*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004); T. Thiemann, *Lectures on Loop Quantum Gravity*, Lect. Notes Phys. **631**, 41 (2003), gr-qc/0210094; A. Ashtekar, J. Lewandowski, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, R53 (2004).

[16] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 032307 (2004).

[17] C. Adami N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3470 (1997); B. Groisman, S. Popescu, and A. Winter, e-print quant-ph/0410091.